

1-19-1966

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 01/19/1966

Mildred Paul

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Paul, Mildred, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 01/19/1966" (1966). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 229.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/229>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

Minutes: Special Senate Meeting, 19 January 1966
Presiding Officer: Gerald Moulton, Vice Chairman
Secretary: Mildred Paul

7.455

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Gerald Moulton, Vice Chairman.

ROLL CALL

Senators Present:	Dohn Miller	Charles Lauterbach
	Gerald Moulton	Monte Reynolds
	William Gaskell	Wilma Moore
	Eldon Jacobsen	Richard Hasbrouck
	Alexander Howard	Marshall Mayberry
	Wayne Hertz	John Shrader
	Joseph Haruda	✓ Floyd Rodine
	Myrtle Carlson	✓ Samuel Mohler
	Stanley Dudley	Robert Yee
	✓ Larry Lawrence	Virgil Olson
	✓ Odette Golden	Clifford Wolfsehr
	✓ Anthony Canedo	James Quann
		Robert Logue

Senators Absent: Daryl Basler
Charles Wright
Lloyd Buckles

Alternates Present: Thomas Collins
E. Frank Bach (replaced Hertz who left shortly
after the meeting started)
Shirley Waugh
David Dillard

Others Present:	James Brooks	Edward Klucking
	Donald Warner	Curt Wiberg
	Dan Willson	Roy Ruebel
	Gerald Verner	Everett Irish

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION NO. 221: Miller moved, seconded by Moore, that the minutes for the meeting of January 5, 1966 be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Approval of the minutes for the meeting of January 12, 1966 was delayed after Lawrence stated he felt that the minutes should include the statement made by Dr. Brooks: That if the Lawrence proposals regarding a curriculum committee passed the Senate and faculty procedures for a Code amendment, the President would send the proposals to the Board of Trustees with a "no pass" recommendation on the grounds that the proposals are in directive language and the Senate can only recommend. The discussion was not included in the minutes as Dr. Brooks was not speaking to this issue.

at the time the statement was made. Since the Lawrence proposals are on the agenda for the meeting today it was decided to delay action on the minutes of January 12 until after discussion was held on the issue at this meeting.

REPORTS

There were no reports.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Vice Chairman announced no communications had been received.

Mohler asked to speak and read a prepared statement (see attachment No. 1).

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Code changes regarding the election of faculty senators.

MOTION NO. 222: Haruda moved, seconded by Shrader, to take Motion No. 219 from the table. The motion was defeated with 14 yes votes, 13 no votes and 1 abstention as follows:

Yes: Miller, Moulton, Collins, Gaskell, Jacobsen, Howard, Bach, Haruda, Carlson, Reynolds, Moore, Shrader, Quann, Dillard.

No: Dudley, Lawrence, Golden, Canedo, Lauterbach, Hasbrouck, Mayberry, Rodine, Mohler, Yee, Olson, Wolfsehr, Logue

Abstain: Shirley Waugh

Rodine raised the question again as to whether action should be taken on a past motion. The Vice Chairman reiterated his ruling that any motion which directs the Code Committee will be considered even if it supercedes a previous motion.

MOTION NO. 223: Lawrence moved, seconded by Golden, to appeal the ruling of the Vice Chairman. There was a question about the voting and the Parliamentarian stated that a "yes" vote would sustain the ruling of the Vice Chairman. The vote was 10 yes, 16 no, and 2 abstentions as follows:

Yes: Moulton, Gaskell, Jacobsen, Howard, Haruda, Carlson, Reynolds, Moore, Shrader, Dillard

No: Miller, Bach, Dudley, Lawrence, Golden, Canedo, Lauterbach, Hasbrouck, Mayberry, Rodine, Mohler, Yee, Olson, Wolfsehr, Quann, Logue

Abstain: Collins, Waugh

MOTION NO. 224: Miller moved, seconded by Reynolds, that Motion No. 203 be rescinded. The motion failed for lack of a 2/3rds vote (15-yes, 13-no) as follows:

Yes: Miller, Moulton, Collins, Gaskell, Howard, Bach, Haruda, Carlson, Lautherbach, Reynolds, Moore, Shrader, Waugh, Quann, Dillard.

No: Jacobsen, Dudley, Lawrence, Golden, Canedo, Hasbrouck, Mayberry, Rodine, Mohler, Yee, Olson, Wolfsehr, Logue.

In view of the stalemate, concern was expressed for the direction to be given the Code Committee regarding the issue.

MOTION NO. 225: Quann moved, seconded by Haruda, that the Senate reopen debate on Motion No. 203. The motion carried with Rodine abstaining.

Jacobsen spoke in favor of presenting to the faculty at a hearing two or three alternate methods of electing senators. Shrader stated the faculty had been polled when the committee was preparing its recommendations and the faculty who replied were in favor of equal representation. Various methods of representation were discussed: 1 senator per department, representation at-large, a fractionated scale of representation. Haruda proposed: Each department, including administration, of 10 or more persons shall elect one senator for every 10 full-time equivalent persons (or major fraction of 10). Departments of 9 or less shall join with other similar departments to form a group of 10 or more persons, electing one senator for every 10 full-time equivalent persons or major fraction thereof. Reynolds spoke to his "Proposed Rewording of Section IID of the Faculty Code to Provide for the Election of Senators."

MOTION NO. 226: Rodine moved, seconded by Miller, that the Chair instruct interested senators to present in writing to the President's office, plans for Senate reorganization by 5 p.m. Wednesday, January 26, which the President in turn will circulate to senate members as the bases for discussion at a meeting to be held Wednesday, February 2, 1966. And further that other senate business be suspended until this discussion be held.

Yee moved, seconded by Howard, that the last sentence be deleted from Motion No. 226. The motion to amend Motion No. 226 carried with Miller, Olson, and Rodine voting no.

Motion No. 226 carried with Collins, Hasbrouck and Logue voting no.

MOTION NO. 227: Olson moved, seconded by Lauterbach, that the meeting be adjourned. The motion failed with Lawrence abstaining.

B. Reorganization of Senate committee structure: (1) Senate Curriculum Committee

MOTION NO. 228: Lawrence moved, seconded by Golden, that a Faculty Curriculum Committee be created and empowered as a standing committee of the Senate, and that the following statement be adopted as a description of its duties and responsibilities:

"The Senate Faculty Curriculum Committee shall be concerned with the study, development, and improvement of curriculum and educational policy in the College; it will review the work of the various College instructional committees, apprise the Senate of plans and developments in curriculum and educational policy, and make recommendations for Senate consideration and action in these areas."

The motion carried unanimously.

Jacobsen suggested that the Code Committee be instructed to prepare the wording so that the Code would include this committee. There was a discussion as to whether it was necessary to have a Code change as the Senate is already empowered by the Code to appoint its own committees. The opinion was expressed that it might be desirable to have the committee listed along with the other standing committees of the Senate so that it wouldn't be overlooked in subsequent years.

C. Reorganization of Senate committee structure: (2) Committee on Committees.

Lawrence explained he wished to withdraw his proposed motion to establish a senate Committee on Committees because the proposed duties and responsibilities of the committee could be assigned to the present Senate Personnel Committee.

MOTION NO. 229: Yee moved, seconded by Gaskell, that the present Senate Personnel Committee explore the problems of faculty committee appointments and bring back a recommendation to the Senate. The motion carried with Miller abstaining.

It was pointed out by Howard that this would only involve a Code interpretation because it was already within the rights of the Senate to be involved with committee appointments as stated on page 4 of the Code under Section L-2 which says that the Faculty Personnel Committee shall be concerned with...possible inequities or discriminations relating to such matters as...non-teaching load. The Vice Chairman stated the functions of the Personnel Committee in this regard has been limited because the right has not been exercised. It was suggested that this interpretation be placed in the Code.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m. upon motion by Gaskell.

Members of the Faculty Senate:

Because of laryngitis I would like to read this statement (or have it read) rather than to ad lib and perhaps be misunderstood. May I apologize in advance for its length, but as one who served thirteen years on the Faculty Council and after three years and will soon sever connection with the Senate, I crave your indulgence. Because I was one of those who helped to "sell" the faculty on the plan to substitute the Faculty Senate for the Faculty Council, I do feel a special responsibility. If I speak frankly, it is because I think it is time to speak frankly.

I must admit that the matters which have caused so much agitation in the Senate recently do cause me concern. I am puzzled by the President who said in the hearing of several faculty people besides myself three years ago that whether he was made chairman of the Senate was "immaterial" and now demands that position as his right. And I was distressed at the President's statement last week that unless the amendment on representation met his wishes he would urge the Board of Trustees to reject it. Has the President forgotten that one of the arguments he gave for forming a Senate was to enable representatives to "legislate?" Yet it appears that we cannot even legislate regarding our own organization unless he approves of each proposal in detail.

Yet these unpleasant episodes of recent weeks are not the basic problem. They are but straws in the wind but they do show direction. The basic problem before the Senate is an old problem. What is its function? Are we only one more advisory committee whose recommendations the President feels free to ignore? Are we only a debating society? Is the Senate at present a facade only, the appearance of faculty participation without the substance? Or is it to become a device whereby the president and representatives of administration and a few departments shall decide matters for the entire faculty? The recent talk of "power" is quite beside the point. What power does the Senate have now? Fully three-fourths of our time and energy are spent in discussing matters which have already been decided by departments and administrators. When did we last disapprove of something sent down to us? When did we last take the initiative (except in Code revision) on anything very significant? Is the rubber-stamp our principal function?

I for one would like to see a Senate which deals with significant items on its own initiative. I would like to see it demand a part in such significant matters as reorganization of the faculty was, and from which we were pointedly bypassed. I would like to see a Senate which would insist on having an important part in over-all planning for the future. I would like to see a continuing dialogue between the teaching faculty and administrative officers on such subjects as "Where are we going? What is the best way of getting there? etc." I would like to see the Senate freed from such niggling chores and meaningless activities which crowd the agenda each meeting. All this argument about one for every ten or one for every fifteen or one for every department leaves me very cold. With the Senate's functions made meaningful, we might expect people to look over the narrow departmental boundaries and see the College as a whole.

Well, that is my hope. I'm sure some will think it shows just how naive I am.

Samuel R. Mohler

JAN 17 1966

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

January 14, 1966

Special Senate Meeting
January 19, 1966
Hertz Music Building
Room 123, 4 p.m.

AGENDA

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes for the meeting of January 5, 1966

III. REPORTS

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Code changes regarding the election of faculty senators.

B. Reorganization of Senate Committee structure

1. Senate Curriculum Committee

2. Committee on Committees

C. Membership and chairmanship of college committees.